

Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Stefanopoulos et al and in view of Schmandt et al. Applicant traverses the examiner's interpretation of the prior art and the finding of obviousness.

Stefanopoulos et al is concerned with a hypermedia computer-aided expert system, while Schmandt discusses a speech interface for windows based systems. Neither of these references individually or in combination teaches or suggests the Applicant's invention. The combination of the references would not teach or suggest Applicant's invention to one with ordinary skill in the art. The cited art does not even mention accessing a data base over the internet or any other network. As amended, the claims more clearly show that the information resource is not a typical local data base such as Stefanopoulos's expert system. In contrast, the Applicant claims a system for accessing remote data across a network such as the internet.

Further, the cited art does not teach suggest the type of browser which is described in the specification. The Examiner has used the user interface associated with the expert system to find the browser element of the Applicant's claim. The cited art does not teach or suggest a browser as the term is defined in the application and used by the Applicant.


The cited art is not concerned with the same area of the art or the problems solved by Applicant's invention. Applicant's invention is concerned with improving the ease of using a complex database such as the internet. It allows the user to easily make voice grammars for accessing the World Wide Web, and to create speakable hyperlinks to pages accessed on the web. The cited art in combination does not teach or suggest to one in the art ways to accomplish these ends, thus how the examiner finds the cited art makes the Applicant's invention obvious without using the applicant's invention to piece together the prior art and fill in the missing pieces is not clearly shown. The combination of the cited references would not result in anything even similar to Applicant's inventions without using the Applicant's application as a guidebook.

In rejecting claims 2, 3 and 6, the Examiner has stated that Stefanopoulos teaches embedded intelligence in a hypermedia source. Applicant believes the term "intelligence" as used in the cited art and in the present claim is completely different. To clear up this confusion, Applicant has amended the claim to reflect the type of "embedded intelligence" that was intended, i.e., embedded grammars and links to grammars or other data to facilitate voice activation. As amended, the claim is patentable over the cited art since the prior art does not teach or discuss this feature of Applicant's invention.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 11 to more clearly distinguish over the prior art. As amended, in view of the above argument, these claims are now in condition for allowance. Other changes to the dependent claims were made to more clearly reflect Applicant's invention and are also now in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection and allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed telephone number and address.

Respectfully submitted,



Bret J. Petersen
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 37,417

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474, M/S 219
Dallas, Texas 75265
(972) 995-5492